

Illinois U Library

MAY 1, 1947

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



What Should We Do About Germany Now?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

LOUIS LOCHNER

WILLIAM L. SHIRER

REBECCA WEST

THURMAN ARNOLD

(See also page 15)

COMING

—May 8, 1947—

What Can We Do To Get More Housing?

U. OF I.
LIBRARY

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 13, NUMBER 1



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MAY 1:

"What Should We Do About Germany Now?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Mr. LOCHNER	4
Mr. SHIRER	6
Mr. ARNOLD	8
Miss WEST	10
THE SPEAKER' COLUMN	15
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	17

THE BROADCAST OF MAY 8:

"What Can We Do To Get More Housing?"

The Broadcast of May 1, 1947, originated in the 58th Street Theater of the American Broadcasting Company in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MAY 1, 1947

VOL. 13, No. 1

What Should We Do About Germany Now?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Last week we invited you to participate in a nation-wide expression of opinion on the question, "Does Our New Foreign Policy Lead to Peace or War?" Your response was almost overwhelming.

More than 15,000 letters, cards, and telegrams were received here at Town Hall from every state in the Union. We told you we would announce the results tonight, and we will. But in order not to infringe upon the topic we are about to discuss, we'll do so at the end of this program.

With the close of the Moscow Conference we are still faced with a major question of what to do about Germany, a nation which started two world wars in a single generation.

Two major dilemmas face us: The first is how to help Germany become a self-sustaining and respectable nation without at the same time permitting her to be-

come a threat to world peace within the next ten to twenty years. The second dilemma is how to get a workable agreement among the allied powers who shared in the victory over Germany, particularly between Soviet Russia and the United States of America.

The Moscow Conference, as General Marshall stated last Monday night, brought the critical differences between these two powers clearly into the light of day for the first time. He gave us hope, on the basis of his conversation with Generalissimo Stalin, that these differences would be ironed out, but in the meantime, he reminded us that the patient is sinking while the doctors deliberate.

The doctors in this case are the representatives of the sovereign nations who cannot agree on five things: the kind of a government Germany should have, the nature of her economy, how reparations

should be paid, how the boundaries of Germany should be fixed, and how the 51 states who participated in a victory over Germany should participate in making the peace.

It's evident that the allied powers didn't make a very good peace with Germany in 1918 or we would not have had another world war started by Germany in 1939. So every person within the hearing of our voices here tonight, and every member of his or her family, has a vital, a very vital, stake in this question.

What, then, should we do about Germany now? Our four authorities, Louis Lochner, William L. Shirer, Thurman Arnold, and Rebecca West, will give us the benefit of their counsel and will answer questions from this representative Town Meeting audience.

Now, may we hear first from a famous journalist, newspaper correspondent, radio commentator, and author who has spent most of his life as a foreign correspondent in Europe since 1919, particularly in Germany, and who was selected by former President Hoover to accompany him on his latest mission to Germany. I give you Mr. Louis Lochner. Mr. Lochner. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lochner:

Mr. Chairman, during my recent visit to Berlin with Mr. Hoover, I ran into an old friend, an intelligence officer. He knows Germany well; he had been there

before the war. He speaks the German language, he understands German psychology.

I asked him, "What should we do about Germany now?"

"Quite simple," he replied, "feed them and let them work."

A mass of indisputable facts gathered by the Hoover Mission justified the appalling conclusion of our former President's first report. I quote: "... but those who believe in vengeance and the punishment of a great mass of people not concerned in the Nazi conspiracy can now have no more givings, for all of them, in food, warmth, and shelter, have been sunk to the lowest level known in a hundred years of western history."

Already last November, General Clay, the unsentimental, hardboiled head of the American Military Government in Germany, warned that the German standard of living must be raised immediately if democracy is to prevail. And Secretary Marshall has just told us that the patient is sinking while the doctors deliberate.

It is useless to try to pour the blessings of democracy to a person with an empty stomach who is living in rags in an overheated dungeonlike cellar. That is how millions of Germans today are living—three or four to a single room, 12 x 12 feet.

All other considerations, such as the form and functions of the future German state, reparations,

boundaries of the Reich, the nature of Germany economy, the re-education of the Germans, are subordinate to the immediate problem before us, that of providing food, clothing, and shelter for millions of Germans reduced to abject poverty, who by the terms of "unconditional surrender" have become allied wards.

Nobody, however, least of all the American taxpayer, wants Germany to be a permanent public charge. Hence the Intelligence Officer's second observation: "Let them work."

The German of today is prevented from resuming constructive work along numerous lines by two policies of the occupation powers. The first is the excessive limitations upon peaceful production. Mr. Arnold, I naturally hold no brief for war production, which is definitely out. The second is denazification as administered.

Germany can't raise food without fertilizers, seeds, tools, transportation, and marketing and storage facilities. Germany cannot import food unless she can export goods in payment. She cannot pay reparations unless she can export. She cannot export unless she can produce. Simple, isn't it, but fundamental.

It does not make sense, in this atomic age, to prevent Germany from re-opening industrial plants desperately needed for peacetime production. It is indefensible, for

instance—Miss West, I trust, will agree with me on this—to continue to demolish fertilizer plants when all Europe is crying for fertilizers.

To put a curb on certain German industries for fear of possible, though not probable, tanks and guns seems absurd to the atomic scientists. Besides such manufacture is definitely forbidden under the Potsdam Agreement as are military establishments, both of which were permitted Germany after World War I. This dread of what battered Germany might do after recovery from her unparalleled beating seems to indicate a most deplorable lack of faith in the evangelistic power of the democratic ideal.

The positive establishment of democracy will prove an infinitely better safeguard against the recrudescence of nazism and militarism than the negative curb of repressive measures on peaceful industries.

There are those who consider all Germans imbued with what Mr. Shirer calls "the German mentality," but such an approach is distinctly the nazi way of assessing races and peoples. All my efforts ever to convince a Nazi that there are good Jews and bad Jews met with the rejoinder, "They're all alike." The Shirer conception is, in effect, that all Germans are alike and potentially bad.

Denazification goes far beyond punishing criminally guilty Hitlerites and rendering nazism innocuous.

Where is the sense, for instance, of making a German engineer remove rubble when his technical skill might build a much needed bridge? By what right is a man who chances to have been born with a title almost automatically excluded from participation in the reconstruction of Germany?

But democracy will not impress itself upon the German as a superior mode of life unless our American troops, our administrative personnel, are themselves shining examples of democracy at its best. Greatest care must, therefore, be shown in the selection of personnel, now, more than ever, since Russia seems to leave us no choice except to go our own way in the Western Zone. Summing up, we should try to improve the standard of living in Germany, put all willing hands to work, and teach democracy by personal example. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Louis Lochner. Now may we hear from the celebrated author of *Berlin Diary* and syndicated columnist of the *New York Herald Tribune*, who was an eyewitness observer of historic events in Europe from 1934 to 1941, who has returned twice to Europe since the war, has just received the 1946 George Foster Peabody award for

outstanding radio reporting and interpretation of news. Well, Bill Shirer, he's put it up to you. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. William Shirer. (Applause.)

Mr. Shirer:

The trouble with Mr. Lochner's argument, ladies and gentlemen, is that he is really asking us to repeat the same mistake we made after the first German war. (Applause.) Are our memories going to be so short?

Do you not remember that after the last war, we poured our billions into Germany to put her back on her feet. You couldn't get democracy in Germany on empty stomachs, people said then, as Mr. Lochner says now, so we filled those German stomachs, rebuilt German industry, and did we get democracy and peace? We got Hitler and war.

No, democracy and the passion for peace do not depend on the state of the German stomach. They depend on his mind and spirit. These have not changed despite the German defeat.

Mr. Lochner pleads with us not to demolish those German fertilizing plants. Well, not long ago those plants were making explosives and could do so again. Mr. Lochner argues that the dread of what Germany might do after her recovery indicates a deplorable lack of faith in the power of the democratic ideal.

I think our dread indicates merely a good memory, and I thank God for it.

The first and most important answer to the question, "What Should We Do About Germany Now?" is obvious. The allies must try to get together and stick together. If they don't, if they don't have enough sense, then there will be no solution of the German problem, and our sons will probably have to go through a third German war. Maybe the third one the Germans would win—sort of by the law of averages.

Alas, General Marshall reminded us Monday, the allies are finding it terribly difficult to agree on Germany. So did they the last time after 1918. They failed to agree. The result was World War II. Must this disastrous, murderous business be repeated a third time?

I propose that we carry out the Potsdam Agreement. It has been much maligned of late. Mr. Herbert Hoover, for example, thinks it should be scrapped. On the whole, considering the fallibility of the human beast and the savage destruction which the Germans inflicted on the world, the Potsdam Agreement was a pretty civilized solution. It laid down, and I quote, "It is not the intention of the allies to destroy or enslave the German people. They shall be given the opportunity to prepare for the eventual recon-

struction of their life on a democratic, peaceful basis."

Is that proposal unreasonable, is it unjust?

Mr. Hoover, with whom Mr. Lochner has been associated, proposes that we revive German industry. His plan, if accepted, would make Germany again the greatest industrial power in Europe. But industrial power, in our time, means military power. We know from sad experience what the Germans, with their mentality, are likely to do with such power. Two sad experiences, it seems to me, are enough.

Carry out the Potsdam Agreement then. Denazify and disarm Germany both militarily and industrially. Politically insist, as General Marshall does, that the German state be decentralized and federated—don't give in to the Russians on that. And don't be fooled that the Germans are yet ready for democracy. They are not really interested yet in developing a democratic form of government.

Finally, don't be fooled into believing that Germany has been destroyed and cannot come back. Her potential for economic mastery of Europe is intact. Her Pan-German spirit is still alive. We were fooled once before on that.

I have here some headlines from three American newspapers dated November 12, 1918. One from the old *New York World* reads, "Germany Stripped of All Power."

One from the *New York Sun* says, "Truce Leaves Germany Helpless." A third from the old *Philadelphia Record* says, "Germany Stripped of Power for Harm."

That's what we thought back in 1918. Why make the same mistake again? (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Bill Shirer. Now, we hear from that vigorous, one-time professor of law at Yale University, who rose to national prominence with his book, *The Folk Lore of Capitalism*, who became Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Anti-Trust Division in 1938 where he remained for five years until he became an Associate Justice of the United States Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. He resigned from the bench in 1945 to practice law in the Nation's Capitol and to speak his mind occasionally on public questions, as he is about to do here tonight. Welcome back to Town Meeting, Judge Thurman Arnold. Judge Arnold. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Arnold:

Today, in the main I agree with Bill Shirer. (*Applause.*) I don't dispute what Mr. Lochner says about the terrible conditions in Germany or the need to make Germany self-supporting.

Secretary Marshall said Monday, "German economy, at the present time, is crippled by the fact that there is no unity of action.

The rehabilitation of Germany to the point where she is self-supporting demands immediate decision." Marshall does not want compromise to exhaustion. Neither do I.

But it isn't true, as Mr. Lochner implies that Germany is prevented from resuming peaceful work by any policies of the occupation powers. They're not yet up to any levels of production set by occupation powers.

Germans can't work because they have no coal. They have no coal because miners are hungry. Miners are hungry because there is no coal for transportation of food. Somebody has to break this vicious circle.

Our emergency policy is not in dispute here. The Truman Doctrine has been accepted by the American people. It puts to the American frontier anywhere in the world where communist expansion threatens American security. Communism expands whenever there is hunger and economic chaos. So we have decided that to resist the threat of communism America must fight hunger and economic chaos with food.

This is a tough assignment particularly when we thought we could cut taxes. But America has decided to stop communist expansion and that's the way to do it.

So we're not talking tonight about an emergency policy but rather the long-run policy of making Germany a peaceful democracy.

Mr. Lochner follows the policy of the Hoover report. Whether he intends it or not, his program would create a strong nationalistic, undemocratic Germany which would again dominate European industry.

We all want a self-sustaining Germany but it must be a servant in the economy of Western Europe and not the master. Germany as a dominating economic power must be destroyed.

Mr. Lochner sees no danger in rehabilitating the present German industrial organization under its old leadership. Mr. Shirer and I think that such a program would mean the revival of a German-dominated Europe and that's the issue. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Shirer has talked about the necessity of political decentralization. I want to emphasize the necessity of economic decentralization. Hitler was a product of German monopoly control. Between the two wars, Germany became a hierarchy of corporations, called cartels, controlled at the top by a few men who fixed prices and restricted production by agreements with great corporations in America and England.

The result was permanent unemployment in Germany. Then a revolution. Hitler seized control of German industry by controlling the top men. He seized control of a system that was already regimented. It was the prophecy of

Karl Marx coming true—that the end of monopoly power is socialism except that Karl Marx did not understand that socialism meant dictatorship.

The men of the Weimar Republic thought that they could control the cartel system by some sort of regulation. I understand Mr. Hoover thinks that if the old Germany system is revived, the Allies can control it by regulation.

But I insist that no political government can control the men who have acquired domination of its industry unless it takes them over as Hitler did.

Centralized industry ends in centralized government. The American and British businessmen who want the old German industrial structure rehabilitated and set on its feet are not bad men, but they are the same group that before the war made the agreements with German cartels which restricted production in the democracies and increased it in Germany in order to avoid competition at home. They made the world a network of private and protective tariffs.

Today they want to buy interests in German industry again. At the same time, they are attacking the antitrust policy that the government is trying to apply in Germany. There is neither wealth in peace or strength in war for the democracies in that kind of industrial regimentation.

It is true that Germany must

export to live, but the cartel system which now exists in Germany and which has powerful support in America is built around the single idea of avoiding competition by restricting imports and exports.

We cannot afford to let Germany build up its present vast industrial production under the system it had before the war and still has today.

What must we do about Germany? We must put strict controls over German production, until it is clear that a free competitive economy is developing in Germany. We must not imperil the security of the world by reviving the old Germany—80 per cent of whose old war industry and 100 per cent of whose old monopoly ideas are still undestroyed. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Thurman Arnold. Our question is, "What Should We Do About Germany?" so it is fitting that we hear now from a representative of our great ally, Great Britain. In parentheses, let me assure you that we would be delighted to have an official spokesman of Russia on this program if we could persuade one of them to speak.

So, Rebecca West, novelist, critic, essayist, who covered the Nuremberg trials so brilliantly for the *New Yorker* magazine, we welcome you to America's Town Meeting of the Air and trust that

you will not be impelled by courtesy to temper your celebrated wit and forthrightness. It was one of your countrymen, Lord Lytton by name, who said from our Town Hall platform some years ago—"Let enemies be cautious; friends should be frank." We welcome you as a great friend, Rebecca West. (*Applause.*)

Miss West:

I don't love or hate the Germans. Over in Europe, we've given up national loves and hates because we're too busy dealing with specific problems which we have to solve if we are to stay alive. We judge nations according to their likeliness to cooperate with us on the solution of those problems.

Now, I have to take into account, all the time, that the Germans are not likely to be good if cooperating because they are liable to go mad.

I saw them go mad in 1933. My husband and I had friends in Germany who, until then, had seemed just like the rest of us—civilized people who liked tolerance and hated racial discrimination, and had a distaste for cruelty. But when Hitler seized power, we were sorry for these people. We thought they would be terribly ashamed and unhappy. We went over a week or two later, and they had all changed. They were practically mad—mad as Hitler—and they were mouthing nonsense, chiefly

the effect that it was right to torture Jews and Social Democrats because, they said, "Germany had been on the eve of a revolution to which most Jews and all Social Democrats would, in fact, have been opposed."

No subsequent development of an underground movement in Germany can wipe that out. The revolt came much later in the war, quite late, and when it was obvious that Hitler was leading the country into defeat—till then, the country was for him.

Therefore, I think we have to regard Germans as mental patients whose permanent cure is to be prayed for, and I really mean prayed. This means that the first thing that we have to do with Germany is not to expect too much of her. A life broken by madness is not likely to be as happy as a life which has never been touched by insanity.

Politically, I think that we have to break Germany into a federation of states just like the plan approved by General Marshall and Mr. Bevin. Because a centralized state would give the nation-wide nazi organization such as the Gestapo and the SS an opportunity to revive, either as themselves or as communist organizations.

But do let us realize that this federation is not going to have an easy time. The component parts of the federation, for one thing, are going to be loaded up with a

lot of Germans who will not be native to these parts of the federation—who've been expelled from Eastern Europe, who will suddenly become Prussians, or Bavarians, or Rhinelanders with no sense of loyalty to Prussia, or Bavaria, or the Rhineland. Nine million out of forty-three million in what is now the British-American Zone will be these new and unassimilated citizens.

So you really can't expect an easy political life for Germany, but this arrangement is the best we can do. Since it is a poor best, we will have to watch over Germany for many years to come, and be ready to control her with whatever arms the development of the art of warfare necessitates. This is a repulsive nuisance, but better than the development of a police state the center of fascism.

Now, I'm willing to concede that the Germans are not bad but mad. But they have ruined my life twice over, and I don't want to eat with them, I don't want to drink with them, and I don't want to play with them. But I think I'll have to work with them.

They have industrial genius and I think it's wrong not to let them use it. The world is passing through a poor spell. We can't afford to waste any human talent that would help build up the worth of the world again.

We can't afford to take the men who created such great enterprises

as the optical glassworks at Zeiss, and force them back into the limited sphere of agriculture, and since this industry might form a war potential we will have to watch it with vigilance, and be ready to make use of our arms.

But I wouldn't accept the thesis that if you look after the economic system of Germany, you won't have to look after her political system. I think that the Nazis took the economic system of Germany and shaped it according to their political ideas. They built up a huge war machine and had to use it and the industrial system had very little power to influence that essentially political process.

For myself, I don't believe that denazification is likely to have any very beneficial influence on the state of Germany. Persons guilty of crimes, committed when they were Nazis should be tried for their crimes. But don't let's worry who were Nazis and who were not, because I can remember a man who really was not a Nazi, explaining to me and my husband that if we could look into Hitler's eyes, into Hitler's beautiful eyes, we could see that he was a man of peace just like the Christ.

Now, let's forget, if we can, all about the madness of Germany but only as a physician forgets his patient's symptoms, to remember them if need be for his sake and for the community's sake.

Let us also remember these words, "Physician, heal thyself."

The best preventive of mischief in Germany is political and economic stability at home. If we cannot manage our democratic society satisfactorily, we will cause a revival of Nazism in Germany or a headlong stampede into communism.

Therefore, we in America and Great Britain must also aim at a steady level of prosperity with equitable distribution of the fullest possible production of wealth, and what's very important, indeed, the fullest preservation of our civil liberties. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

I know that your colleagues are joining me in congratulating you on packing so much into a five minute speech.

Now, our friends of the radio audience, if you happen to hear ticking noise, let me assure you that it is not a time bomb in your radio, but just the movies operating here, taking pictures of tonight's production.

Now, if you, Miss West and Mr. Lochner, Mr. Shirer, and Judge Arnold, will join me up here around the microphone, perhaps we can have a little discussion before we take the questions from this representative audience.

Mr. Lochner, we haven't heard from you for a while, so I expect you have something to say to Mr. Shirer at this point.

Mr. Lochner: I have a lot to say but first of all, Mr. Arnold, you

are making me say something that I never dreamed of saying. You are saying that I am trying, under the old leadership, to reestablish German industry. I have been living under the Nazis so long I think I am a little more allergic to them than you are.

Again, I am sorry to say that both Mr. Shirer and Mr. Arnold have apparently not read the Hoover report. They don't know what they're talking about. Mr. Hoover states expressly, "I assume that we will not make the major mistake of Versailles but will complete absolute disarmament of the Germans so that they shall not be able again to engage in aggression; that this disarmament will embrace destruction of all military arms, fortifications, and direct arms factories with certain control of industry; that the Germans will have no army, no navy, no air forces, retaining only a constabulary in which no Nazi, or previous army officer may be employed; that this disarmament must be continued for a generation or two, until Germany has lost the "know how" of war and the descent of militarism through birth." Is that enough for a sample?

Mr. Shirer: May I interrupt for a second?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Shirer, come along.

Mr. Shirer: Mr. Lochner, I happened to read very carefully the three Hoover reports, and I am in-

terested in those six assumptions which you just read, of Mr. Hoover. He made six assumptions of what should take place in Germany in regard to his program.

My complaint about the six assumptions is that they are not valid and that he wants to go ahead and build up Germany before these six assumptions become true. That's what we have against the Hoover plan. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Arnold wants to get in on this.

Mr. Arnold: I don't think, Mr. Lochner, that you realize that you're setting up Germany under the old leadership, but that's the tragedy of it. That is what you're doing. (*Applause.*)

Let's take some of these men that are back of you. Here's an article in the *New York Times* recently. "Sharp criticism of military interference with economic affairs was expressed by business groups. The policy should be the winning buyer meeting the winning seller. Instead of military interference in German production, we should stop bureaucratic control and confusion over the trade." There the boys are moving in, buying, and ready to repeat.

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Lochner?

Mr. Lochner: I was going to make another remark about Mr. Shirer's whole approach, and that is, he's just 25 years behind the times. He still thinks in terms of

World War I. It's already pointed out he forgot atomic energy, but he also forgot that, after the first World War, Germany was virtually intact; now we have a shattered situation. He forgets that at that time we put no limitations on, in fact we permitted, the manufacture of arms and permitted an army to continue.

We were very lax in our controls at the time—a thing that seems to be now out of the question in view of the fact that we are actually at an unprecedented thing in American history—ready to commit ourselves to 25 years, which was even extended to 40 years by General Marshall, of seeing to it that there is no German aggression. Still Mr. Shirer goes back 25 years. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Lochner, you lash out first with your right and then with your left at Mr. Arnold and Mr. Shirer here. I don't want you to forget what Mr. Arnold said, but Mr. Shirer is right here at my elbow, and he has a comment.

Mr. Shirer: Gentlemen, don't take my word for it, that Germany has not been destroyed. A year ago, Henry H. Fowler, director of the Enemy Branch of the Foreign Economic Administration, told the Congress, after an investigation by the American Government of the damage done in Germany, "Although Germany today is defeated, and its economic life temporarily

at a standstill, the industrial base of its aggression, the base which built up over the last 25 years and which enabled it nearly to conquer the world, is virtually untouched."

And Leo Crowley, who at that time was head of the Foreign Economic Administration added this, in a sworn testimony before the Senate Committee, "If we were to leave Germany to its own devices and not to institute a program of economic and industrial disarmament, Germany could be far better prepared for war within five years than she was in '39" (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Miss West, I haven't heard from you about this.

Miss West: Well, I would just like to say that it's extraordinary how tough the human animal is and I don't think Germany is really so bomb-shattered as you would think. I find confirmation in the fact that my husband and I constantly get letters, from Germans that we knew, asking my husband to use his influence to help them to get right back in the trade which they are apparently prepared to do almost at once.

Mr. Arnold: I want to add something to that. Because I disagree with Miss West that the political form is subordinate to the economic form. You start these arguments all over again, and they take care of the political govern-

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

REBECCA WEST—Rebecca West is the pen name of Mrs. Henry Maxwell Andrews (nee Cicily Isabel Fairfield), who was born in County Kerry, Ireland.

When she was ten, her father died and she moved with her mother to Edinburgh, Scotland. Here she was educated at George Watson Ladies' College. She also attended a London dramatic academy. She was on the stage a short time and from this period of her career comes her pen name which is the name of the heroine of Ibsen's *Rosmersholm*.

In 1911, Miss West joined the staff of the *Freewoman* and became a political writer on the *Clarion* the following year. She was active in the fight for woman's suffrage and her political essays and literary criticisms appeared in many papers and magazines.

Miss West is the author of many books, each quite different from the others. Her article on the Nuremberg trials appeared in the *New Yorker* in 1946.

LOUIS PAUL LOCHNER—Newspaper correspondent, lecturer, and radio commentator, Mr. Lochner was born in Springfield, Illinois. He is a graduate of the Wisconsin Conservatory of Music and has an A.B. degree from the University of Wisconsin where he was editor of the *Wisconsin Alumni Magazine* and *The Cosmopolitan Student*.

Mr. Lochner has been a lecturer for the American Peace Society and the University of Wisconsin extension division, and director of the Central West Department of the American Peace Society. In 1915-16, he was secretary to Henry Ford on the Ford Peace Mission to Europe. He served as secretary for the Neutral Conference for Continuous Mediation at Stockholm and at The Hague, and as editor of the International Labor News Service.

A newspaper correspondent since 1919, Mr. Lochner has been chief of the Berlin Bureau of the Associated Press since 1928. He was the first foreign correspondent allowed to follow the German Army into Poland in September 1939. Until our entrance into the war he sent his news from Holland, Belgium, France, Yugoslavia, Greece, Finland, and Russia. He was also a radio commentator and news analyst for Press Association, Inc., and the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. Lochner was a member of the recent Hoover Mission to Germany at the special request of ex-President Hoover. Mr. Lochner is the author of several books and has translated several others.

WILLIAM LAWRENCE SHIRER—Mr. Shirer, author, radio commentator, and syndicated columnist, was born in Chicago, in 1904. While attending Coe College, in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, he was sports editor of a newspaper. Following graduation, Mr. Shirer went to New York, but was unable to find a job. He sailed for Europe where he obtained a position in the Paris office of the *Chicago Tribune*.

After a year, he became foreign correspondent for the *Tribune* and for the next six years the Continent was his beat. From 1929 to 1932, he was chief of the *Tribune's* European Bureau with headquarters in Vienna. In 1930 and 1931, however, he spent some time in India and Afghanistan. He became a friend and admirer of Mahatma Gandhi.

From 1935 to 1937, Mr. Shirer was foreign correspondent for the Universal News Service. From 1937 until 1940, when his anti-Nazi broadcasts made things a little too hot for him in Germany, he was Continental representative for the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Returning to America, Mr. Shirer wrote his best seller, *Berlin Diary*. Until recently, Mr. Shirer has been heard regularly over the American Broadcasting Company network. He was awarded the 1946 George Foster Peabody award for outstanding radio reporting and interpretation of the news. His syndicated column may be read in many papers.

THURMAN ARNOLD—Born in Laramie, Wyoming, in 1891, Thurman Arnold came East for his college education—A.B., Princeton, 1911; LL.B., Harvard, 1914; and M.A., Yale, 1931. Admitted to the Illinois bar, he began the practice of law in Chicago. Returning to his home town, he practiced law at Laramie from 1919 to 1927. He also lectured in law at the University of Wyoming from 1921 to 1926, when he became dean of the College of Law of the University of West Virginia (1927-30). Since 1931, Mr. Arnold has been a professor at Yale, but in 1937 he was granted a leave of absence to serve as special assistant to the attorney general of the United States. In March, 1939, he became assistant attorney general in charge of antitrust work in which position he became familiarly known as the "trust buster" of the Department of Justice. Early in 1943 he was appointed an associate justice of the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. He resigned from this position in 1945.

ment as Hitler took care of the Weimar government.

Now, Shanghai, April 29, in today's paper: "Germans in China, including a strong pro-Nazi group are, like the faithful phoenix, rising from their own ashes, bound together in a tight organization, resembling the old Nazi-seized hierarchy. These Germans are rapidly re-establishing themselves in important trade, economic trade, and Chinese government posts."

There we have the organization. There is what Mr. Lochner is unwittingly setting up with plenty of pious protestations that he doesn't want it.

Mr. Denny: All right, Mr. Lochner, that's a point you perhaps want to comment on.

Mr. Lochner: I'm not over in China. I'm not running things over there. Those are organizations that are now loose and independent of what's going on in Germany itself. I'm speaking of the German situation. Yes, we have that under control, and again the men who are speaking about the necessity of decartelization don't seem to realize that, as a matter of fact, decartelization has gone to the point where now everything, except one or two concerns that they are dissolving, is within the Sherman antitrust law or act, so that Mr. Arnold is fighting windmills there. He is speaking of something that no longer exists.

Mr. Arnold: Why then does

General Motors and General Electric protest in the *New York Times* about our decartelization policy. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Lochner: You are talking about Americans. I'm talking about the control in Germany it exists today, and as it is being well handled by our military government officers.

Mr. Denny: Well, you've stirred things up a bit now, and we've come to the point where we must call our audience in on this discussion. In the meanwhile, while we get ready for the question period, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air, brought to you by Town Hall and the American Broadcasting Company. For your convenience we print each week the Town Meeting Bulletin, containing complete transcript of tonight's discussion, including the questions and answers to follow. You may secure tonight's Town Meeting Bulletin by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, enclosing 10 cents to cover cost of printing and mailing.

If you would like to have the bulletin in the handy pocket-size come to you regularly each week, enclose \$1 for 11 weeks, \$2.35 for six months, or \$4.50 for one year. Remember the address: Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Here's where members of our audience have an opportunity to secure a \$210 set of the *Encyclopedia Americana*. If you ask a question which our committee of judges considers best for bringing out new facts and increasing our understanding of this subject, provided also that you limit your questions to 25 words, a 30-volume set of the *Encyclopedia Americana* will be on the way to you tomorrow. Make your questions good, and stick to the point. We start with the gentleman right over here in the first row.

Man: Mr. Lochner. One angle not mentioned here tonight is: Would we not, indirectly, be paying Germany's reparations to Russia by financing and restoring Germany's economy?

Mr. Lochner: The answer is that we would be doing that if General Clay had not put an embargo on paying any reparations out of production to the Russians. At present, the thing is tightly sealed between the two zones. The Russians cannot get anything out of there.

Mr. Denny: The gentleman says he is referring to the future plans.

Mr. Lochner: As I understand the plans of American military government, it has no intention of beginning to finance Russian reparations until Germany has first

recovered—that is, until the American investment is safe that we are putting into this deal.

Mr. Denny. Thank you. The lady on the third row.

Lady: I'm addressing my question to Miss West, though I'd appreciate a comment from the other speakers. Why not treat Germany as we would any outbreak of mass insanity?

Mr. Denny: Miss West, I think you more or less advocated that, didn't you?

Miss West: Well, how does one treat mass insanity?

Mr. Denny: Miss, would you like to tell us how to treat mass insanity?

Lady: That's a question for psychiatrists to work out.

Mr. Denny: Miss West is not a psychiatrist, so we'll let her sit down. Thank you for the observation. Now we'll take a question from the gentleman here on the third row. All right.

Man: I would like to ask Judge Arnold, who made some comment about control of German industry, if he believes that the German war potential in the chemical and light and heavy metal industries can be controlled. I'm not in disagreement with Judge Arnold, but he used that word, and I think I'd rather have him answer the question than Mr. Lochner.

Mr. Arnold: My position is that there is no hope for German democracy unless German industry is broken up into as small units as are consistent with efficiency, and made a part of a larger federated European economy. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lochner: That's exactly Mr. Hoover's plan. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Arnold: That, unfortunately, is the lip service that great American corporate interests give. But over there—I think this is the report of every observer—most of them are apologetic about competition. They want quotas. They want restrictions on production. They want the same old thing they are used to. My point is that that is the group that will come in. The old alliances will be reestablished. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Our questioner wants to talk back.

Man: The cartel people are trying to do the same thing here, aren't they, Judge Arnold?

Mr. Denny: Well, that's just what Judge Arnold said. All right. Now I see several celebrities here in the house tonight, among them, the director of the American Association for the United Nations, Dr. Clark Eichelberger. He has a question. Dr. Eichelberger.

Dr. Eichelberger: Mr. Shirer.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Shirer, stand up and take it. (*Laughter.*)

Dr. Eichelberger: Bill, someone has suggested—I think it was Mr.

Dulles—that the United Nations Commission for a European Reconstruction administer the Ruhr and possibly Silesia for the good of all European economy, rather than Germany. Do you think that's possible?

Mr. Shirer: I think it's not only possible, but I think it's very desirable, too. The trouble with the plans that have been worked out and with Mr. Hoover's plan—Mr. Hoover wants to give the Ruhr straight back to Germany. I think if you talk about a European prosperity, what you've got to do is take the Ruhr, and take Silesia, too, which is now in the hands of the Poles and dominated by the Russians, take those two and make them work for all of Europe, instead of for Germany, because Germany gets them for herself and will make war with them. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. The young man with the bow tie.

Man: Mr. Arnold, how can I be assured of a peaceful Germany, considering our failed policy of denazification?

Mr. Arnold: Well, that is what I'm going to disappoint you about. I don't quite agree with Mr. Shirer. I suppose that the competent men in Germany were Nazis. I do not propose a witch hunt to drive them out. The important thing is to decentralize German industry. Introduce the breath of industrial freedom

nazi implication will take care of itself.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Shirer, come along, sure. It's free for all.

Mr. Shirer: That's one subject that my partner, the Judge, and I disagree on—that was denazification, and I certainly disagree with what Mr. Lochner said. It doesn't seem to me to make sense for us to go into Germany and fail to remove some of the leading Nazis. A few days ago, for example, to give you just an example of how it works, I had word from Germany that a man that Louis Lochner knows well, a chap who was head of the American Press Division in the German Foreign Office when we were there, and a very obnoxious Nazi he was, had just been made prorector of one of the most famous German universities in Germany by our British friends. So this Nazi, and one of the worst, I can assure you, is now head of a great German university which presumably is supposed to educate young Germans for this new democracy of theirs.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Judge Arnold, did you want to comment on that?

Mr. Arnold: Well, Bill, we're not so terribly far apart. I'd remove a few of them, but there's talk of a great campaign. There's supposed to be 250,000 of them. I don't think you can run German industry on a campaign of that character.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Lochner, what about denazification?

Mr. Lochner: Well, again Bill Shirer has quoted me wrong. He says that I am opposed to denazification. I said distinctly "denazification as administered," and there I'm with Mr. Arnold.

Take just a little example. In a little village outside of Stuttgart there were 56,000 people waiting for denazification. You could not get at the top fellows because in between were a whole lot of little "also-rans." Here were 56,000 people, who were kept twiddling their thumbs, not engaged in German economy. I say that kind of a process, where you can have only six or seven, at best, cases tried per day and have this court presiding over 56,000 cases, ties up German economy in a way that the Nazi is not paying for the damage that he has done. I want him to pay. I want him to get back into industry. You can limit his income if you please. You can put certain other restrictions on him but do let him help reconstruct Germany.

Mr. Denny: Now you've got Miss West's ire up. Yes, Miss West.

Miss West: Well, I just wanted to say if you took over a cannibal island and you got people to stop eating Auntie and going on to lamb chops, if you wanted to run the country with the natives, you'd have to use quite a number of

people who were cannibals, who had been cannibals. You wouldn't be able to find a few odd freakish vegetarians. Well, the analogy is like that.

Most people in Germany were with the Nazis, particularly if they were professional people, active people who had to have jobs. You won't find the personnel for the new Germany unless you use Nazis. It's horrible, but it's just how life is. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Shirer: Mr. Lochner said that he was against denazification as administered. Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you how it's administered in Germany now that it's being administered by the Germans. Four hundred and fifty Nazis out of the millions have so far received some kind of a small sentence.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady on this third row, here.

Lady: My question is for Mr. Lochner. Is not the atom bomb one more reason for not rebuilding the economy of a nation of scientific genius and proved historic ruthlessness?

Mr. Lochner: In the first place, you're assuming that there are a lot of atomic physicists left in Germany. They've all been taken either to Russia or to the United States, so I don't see very much of the danger in there. But inherently the whole discussion is going as though they were an incurable, a mad, a cannibal nation.

Now I just want to make one little confession, and that is I'm proud to be working for a new Germany. I'm glad that my son-in-law is at Frankfurt, superintending the American radio there. I'm glad that my son-in-law is in Stuttgart helping in the drafting of constitutions and that sort. And I'm only sorry that I'm too old to be there myself, but I'm keeping up an active correspondence with people who are in a soul-searching sort of way asking advice from Americans. I think it's a task well worth while. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Shirer: What I would like to get from Mr. Lochner is what sort of explanation or guarantee can he give us that this new Germany, as he calls it, is going to be any different from the new Germany we had after 1918? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lochner: I give him no guarantee that this time the United States is actually in there, is supervising—I'm speaking of our zone—that's the only one where we have any influence at the present time and in the previous World War we had a few occupation troops but no government troops. Now the whole government is in American hands. I'm just too proud of America not to think that we're going to make a success of it. The results I've seen there have been very great on the education sector. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Arnold: I think we'll make a success of it, too. My trouble is that I hope we don't make a success of it the way the Hoover report envisages. We can do something to decentralize and make Germany a subordinate part of Europe, but we can't do it Mr. Lochner's way.

Mr. Denny: All right, Mr. Shirer.

Mr. Shirer: Certainly, Mr. Lochner, what happens in Germany in the long run depends not upon what we Americans do. It depends upon what the Germans do and what happens to their spirits, their minds, their mentality. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: One more word from Mr. Lochner. Yes sir.

Mr. Lochner: I agree that it's a matter of the mind or the mentality, but I believe in the positive program of food, clothing, and shelter for Germany as a prerequisite to that kind of a conditioning of the mind and body that he speaks of. As to Mr. Arnold, he insists on talking about something that is past, namely, decartelization in the American zone which has taken place. You ask any military governor about that. We are within the Sherman anti-trust law.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Lochner. Now, all four of our speakers are going to have a final word of summary. Here is Miss Rebecca West for her summary of tonight's discussion. Miss West.

Miss West: For all that Mr. Lochner says, I must believe the Germans are dangerous. Too many people suffered agonies in Germany and died between 1933 and the end of the war and fought the Nazis who did it to them, and I think they were right. I think we have to watch over Germany with arms, hoping we shall never use them against Germany or against any other power. I think that we've got to make the Germans behave well. We've got to make ourselves behave even better. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Miss Rebecca West. And now, a final word from Judge Thurman Arnold. Judge Arnold.

Mr. Arnold: There's a vast difference between a strong nationalistic Germany and a prosperous, self-sustaining Germany that is the subordinate part of unified western Europe. Now the last thing I want to do is to stop production anywhere for the sake of stopping production, but we have emerged from the war with the greatest concentration of industry ever seen in the history of the world, and it's utter nonsense to say that the problem of cartelization is past, because the antitrust laws are still on our books.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Thurman Arnold, and now Mr. William L. Shirer.

Mr. Shirer: To solve the German question and, therefore, the

problem of peace, let's carry out the Potsdam Agreement. This will leave Germany self-supporting, as prosperous as her neighbors, but in no position to make war again. Finally, let's not destroy our memories. Remember what happened the last time we built up Germany and remember, unless we're careful, it'll happen again. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Shirer, and now Mr. Louis Lochner.

Mr. Lochner: I'm opposed to merely negative policy. I believe in a positive program. I believe in the victory of good over evil. I believe in opportunity to work, for the Germans, as an offset to the communist philosophy of despair. I believe in the visible demonstration of the blessings of democracy in the American zone of Germany which is under our control as a stimulant for German democratization.

That is the Christian way of dealing with the enemy. That is the best American tradition. That is putting into practice the old Latin maxim, *Exempla docet*, the example teaches. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Louis Lochner, William L. Shirer, Judge Thurman Arnold, and Rebecca West for helping us to understand a little better the urgent problems that have been vexing the foreign ministers at Moscow and continue to vex us.

Now, we promised you that we'd give you the results of your own expressions of opinion on last week's subject, "Does Our New Foreign Policy Lead to Peace or War?" So, get out your pencil.

We do not attempt to explain the results, but we do want to remind you of these facts. We are not announcing the results of a scientific poll. As a matter of fact, these results will differ sharply from the most recent Gallup Poll on a similar question, announced on March 28, when 30 per cent of the people queried said that our aid to Greece and Turkey was likely to get us into war and 5 per cent said they thought that was not likely while 16 per cent held no opinion on the question. That's the Gallup Poll.

Now we received at Town Hall between Friday of last week up to noon yesterday 13,262 wires, cards and letters from every state in the Nation expressing definite opinions on last week's topic. About 2,000 arrived too late to be counted or were too vague and indefinite.

New York state led with 3,600 votes; California was second with 1,545; Illinois third with 940. Of the total, 9,976 or 75 per cent felt that our new policy leads to war; 3,286 or 25 per cent felt that our new policy leads to peace.

It should be borne in mind that we did not ask the question "Do you approve or disapprove

this foreign policy?" You must, therefore, put your own interpretation on the meaning of these results.

Of an audience estimated in the millions, 13,262 people who heard the program took the trouble to write in and definitely express themselves in this manner.

Now next week we turn to an unsolved domestic problem which has plagued us ever since the war's end—"What Can We Do To Get More Housing?" Our speakers will be Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, Democrat of California; Boris Shishkin, economist of the

American Federation of Labor; Edward R. Carr, president of the National Association of Homebuilders; and John C. Taylor, Jr., president of American Homes, Inc.

This program will originate in the Homeward Gymnasium, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Now our committee of judges is handing me their award for tonight which goes to Mr. David Weiner for his question to Mr. Lochner. We hope you will be with us next week and every week at the sound of the crier's bell. (*Applause.*)



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last

VOLUME 12

17. Can Free Competition Now Prevent Inflation?
18. Will America Progress More Under Republican or Democratic Leadership?
19. Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris?
20. Should Commercial Building Be Curtailed To Provide Homes for Veterans?
21. Are We Heading for War With Russia?
22. Should There Be Any Further Limits on the Right To Strike?
24. What Basic Questions Divide Russia and the United States?
29. Should the Veto Be Abolished in the United Nations?
31. How Should Food Be Distributed After UNRRA Expires?
32. Should the Wagner Labor Relations Act Be Revised?
33. Is Radio Operating in the Public Interest?
34. Is World Disarmament Possible Now?
35. Would You Rather Live in a Small Town or a Big City?
36. Would You Like To Turn Clock Back?
37. Should We Have Labor-Management Courts To Settle Labor Disputes?
38. Should Rent Ceilings Be Lifted?
39. Can We Have a 25% Wage Bo Without Raising Prices?
40. How Can Atomic Energy Be U and Controlled?
42. What's Wrong With American Marriages?
43. Should Congress Outlaw the Clo Shop?
44. How Can We Get and Keep Good Teachers in Our Schools?
45. What Should Be Our Program Germany at the Moscow Conference?
45. What Should Be Our Role Greece and Turkey?
48. How Should the Democracies Meet the Challenge of Spreading Communism?
49. Should the Communist Party be Outlawed in the United States?
50. Do We Really Elect Our President?
51. Are Cooperatives a Threat to Private Enterprise?
52. Does Our New Foreign Policy Lead to Peace or War?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.,
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: } 26 Weeks for C
\$2.35
Single Copies